**National Platform on Land and Water Management  
Steering Committee meeting – ILRI campus, April 26, 2013**

**Present:** AdanaKassa (chair), BetruNedessa (vice-chair), Kees Swaans (secr.), KifleAbegaz, FeyeraAbdi, DeresAbdelkadir, Belay Demissie, DejeneAbesha, Simon Langan

**Absent**: Melaku Tadesse (apologized)

**Note taker:** Tsehay Gashaw

**Agenda**

1. Opening /introduction / announcements
2. Review minutes of former SC meeting
3. Reflection on 4thNational Platform meeting organized in collaboration with Nile BDC (meeting, outputs, and follow up)
   1. Reports on NP meetings
   2. Reflection on the national platform meeting
   3. Briefing on status of NBDC key messages
4. Plan to organize NBDC Regional Stakeholder dialogue workshop: 23-24 July in Bahir Dar
5. Brief presentation on early observation and results of the consultative meetings organized with different stakeholders about the sustainability of the National Platform, ownership and their expectations
   1. Briefing
   2. Implication for national platform
   3. Way forward /next steps
6. Next national platform meeting and TWG learning events
7. Summarizing action items and next meeting
8. **Opening /Introduction and announcements:**

Agenda was introduced by Kees Swaans and he asked whether there was missing point for discussion on the agenda. Agenda was agreed upon by all participants.

Announcement:

* Kees asked the participants if they want to receive the reports/minutes in a printed form or circulating it through email. **They agreed to receive report through email.**
* Kees found out that since January from this year he is not allowed to give per diem and transport allowance for people living in Addis. **Simon indicated that he was not aware of this problem and agreed to check and see if there are some possibilities for compensation through IWMI (also needs to be discussed within NBDC).**

1. **Review of minutes from the former SC meeting:**

Kees went through the minutes of the last SC meeting and it was approved by all. No remarks were made by participants in terms of what was missing in the minutes.

**Kees asked the participants to look through the draft terms of reference (TOR) and give their feedback in two weeks’ time**; after integrating feedback the TOR can be considered final for the platform in its current form.

1. **Reflection on National Platform Meeting**

**Reports from NP meetings**

* Kees first pointed out on the output of the 3rd National Platform meeting with ICRAF; a working document was developed which was shared with members; it is also available on the internet and shared with others
* In terms of the NP with the NBDC there were some discussions within NBDC whether to develop a report or a 2 pager brief; it is agreed to make a short report.

**Reflection**

**Simon**

To have influence, we need to have one message (what are the messages and evidence to be sent to the policy maker). Are the messages right in terms of phrasing to people what we are doing? Are they vague or generic what NBDC is; do other organization understand? I found the national platform with the NBDC very useful to identify and validate evidence based messages

**Kees**

My question to you all is about the process we are following for national platform meetings at the moment. After the 2nd platform meeting, we decided to work with other organization to organize shared events, partly due to resource constraints, but also to ensure that we have a thematic focus during the platform meetings, which is relevant at the moment of conducting it. Hence, we had a 3rdnational platform event with ICRAF in July 2012; was that a good way of sharing and working with other organizations? I thought that the content was very good, with the aim to produce some lessons learned and recommendations, although I found the format not very attractive, many power-points and very traditional ‘scientific’ format. A similar process was followed during the 4th national platform meeting with the NBDC.

**Betru**

There were important technological and technical messages during the event with ICRAF; the presenters were quite professional in the field. They brought important issues forward in the field of natural resource management.

**Dejene**

I hope there is always comparative advantage of the national platform; the NBDC should address this issue in its framework. I am always wondering what happens after the workshop, you keep on meeting after meeting and what is the outcome? It should have a follow up method with continuous feedback. We need to have deliverables, and the momentum to continue. We should be able to benefit from the bigger picture and scale it up

**Simon**

So, how can we take this up? All the messages on these pages (NBDC key messages document), will feed in to the draft extension strategy document (the agriculture extension). This is the bigger picture to influence agricultural policy and strategy at national level.

**Belay**

Do we want to make presentation to SLM technical committee or ask members of this group to take it forwards?

**Dejene**

There was a workshop on SLM harmonization b/n SLM programs in Nazreht…the proceedings are not developed yet

**Belay**

I knew about the meeting but it overlapped with our meeting. This meeting on harmonization of SLM programs is an important meeting; **Belay will follow up with Melaku**.

**Kees**

The document that resulted out of the 4th national platform meeting is about the NBDC key messages, resulting out of the NBDC program and validated during the meeting. Doug Merrey has integrated all comments and shared the document with selected key people but so far, we didn’t get any response. **SC members are requested to have a look at it and send it to Simon or me, so that we can sha**re **it with Doug Merrey (within the next 10 days), which is by the 6thof May.**

**Feyera**

You clearly indicated the proposed next steps; key stakeholders should take responsibility. How can this be defined more clearly among government partners and stakeholders, defining the responsibility role, resources in terms of money, etc.

**Belay**

The national platform meeting with the NBDC was well attended from different institutions, private sector, commercial farmers (they attended for two days) benefited a lot from the presentations and created a connection and network with researchers. Also important to get the buy in from the government higher officials like Seleshi Getahun (state minister NRM)

**Dejene**

It has an implication of bringing the regional people to the mainstream; there was a lot of discussion to include different NGOs to the SLM platform, but because of the limitation of scope and the federal structure, this has implications on engaging different actors; hence I believe that the national platform has comparable advantage and it will increase the momentum

**Deres**

There is one issue I see very basic, we are talking about managing land and water, it is not about water or land only; if we look at the execution level, we have a federal level for managing natural resources. I am not sure how representative that meeting was in terms of execution? When we go down in the structure, I want to see the linkage of water and land and between execution and influence at the policy level? There is probably the need for our platform to link up with what is exists; link with the minster of water and energy, the platform would be more representative. And what is the linkage with WASH, water and climate linkage?…..we need to look at this.

**Dejene**

To get the government buy in, we need to bring higher officials to the opening and closing from the MOA or MoWE. Next time let the closing be by the state minster then we can get the buy in…… invite someone from MOWE for closing then we can do our business [Kees confirmed that the meeting was opened by the state minister]

**Kees**

For NBDC it is clear, it started with water management, we want to work on a landscape level; hence there has been a development of how to look at water management strategies and how water and land issues are interlinked.

1. **NBDC regional stakeholder workshop in Bahir Dar 23-24 July**

**Belay**

* In terms of the NBDC and the national platform, there is a gap at the regional level. Hence, as a follow up to the national platform meeting, we want to have a regional meeting in Bahir Dar with representative of the three regions , Amhara, Oromia and Beshangulgumizi
* It is good to share the outcomes of the NBDC research and other programs with the regional level policy makers and experts.
* In this thinking we have to organize a regional meeting from July 23-24 in Bahir Dar; ARARI, the BOA, and the ABA have agreed to organize the workshop together
* What we still need to do is to make a detailed agenda and decide on participants (idea is to have about 60 participants, 15 from each region and 15 from federal level.

**Dejene**

Whom are you inviting from the three regions in terms of hierarchy, you need to have people like Gedu from Amhara to get the government buy in; we need to involve policy makers and development practitioners.

**Simon**

We will also invite major NGO, private sector, and civil societies from the three regions

**Feyera**

Good to engage parliament people, engaging them in this business; this group could advise us whom to invite (if you ask the ministry people they give you names)

**Kees**

There is study by ODI on the policy development process at the district and regional level; we would like to share their experiences, since the regions are not sharing among themselves; we need to stimulate them to interact among themselves, we need to think about how to get some reaction, and think what we want to get out of it

**Adane**

It is very fundamental to have this regional workshop, as suggested, what we really expect from regions should be discussed from the meeting; initially we were thinking about establishing regional platforms. We should try to create linkages between platforms at different level; in Amhara region they established a platform, but we didn’t link up with it very well. We lack an overview of what is happening in different regions. NBDC should look at what is possible and what are priorities, Instead of reinventing the wheel but look into existing institutional platforms.

**Kees**

The issue will be taken forward, but not possible to address it with the limited timeframe of the NBDC.

**Dejene**

The commitment of the regions is important (organizing the workshop and getting willingness is also one engagement). We need to identify best practices, we have to present our cases, which is normal in a policy making process. We need to start to develop the action plan (the government usually makes plans in June 30), which they submit to the parliament.

1. **Briefing on consultative meeting results (see also annex 1)**

**Belay**

* NBDC is supporting the national platform, so what will happen when the project closes, who will take ownership
* I have consulted different institutional leaders, donors, task force leaders, reviewed government documents, etc.

Some key issues:

* The NBDC initiated the national platforms, which includes thematic working groups; it is overseen by a steering committee
* Concerns: steering committee is limited in number, not diverse enough in terms of gender and type of organization (doesn’t include universities, private sector etc.).
* It has weak linkages with policy makers at national and regional level
* Not clear strategy , it looks like a duplication of the SLM platform
* At regional level, ARARI initiated a platform, but its focus is not clear.
* Members of SLM-TC are close to 25
* The task force lacks human resources

**Dejene**

We [RED-FS] will have a meeting and will include the CGIAR to attend the meeting (invitation will send to Ian and Simon). The meeting is about the performance of 2012; we recruited the independent evaluator. In the SLM task force, IWMI could have the involvement. In terms of the best practice task force, NBDC could be a member.

**Betru**

What kind of linkage are you proposing to the minister of agriculture and water and energy?

**Belay**

The linkage is to work together and to stimulate the learning; it doesn’t mean putting this platform in the task force.

**Dejene**

In my view there should be independent people with its own entity and budget, but it could have relationship with MOA; one member can be a member of the SLM platform or task force.

**Kees**

NBDC doesn’t exist after 2013; so we need to look into sources of funding to continue this

**Feyera**

In terms of inking this platform with SLM, what is the added value over and about the structure that Belay presented?

**Kees**

What do others see as the added value and why it should exist?

**Dejene**

It could be a challenge, but we should find ways this to exist. Who would it report to, it could be a different institution. We are missing representation of private sectors and NGOs; if this group could have been here they might take up the initiative to continue. The very advantage of think tank group is in the contextual membership, the government also should support this. What is the function of national platform compared to the SLM; what we have are different actors, strong effort in research, and on how to link the local and regional on this?

**Kees**

After 2013 where does it need to be embedded? Is it linked to CG or somewhere else?

**Dejene**

It should be linked with CGIAR. This is research for development. If it is embedded to CGIAR system, it will be a potential advantage, it is a research undertaking , knowledge sharing is not limited in Ethiopia. It should be under the framework of CGIAR

**Kifle**

Did you attempt to include climate change?

**Kees**

When we submitted our proposal to DFID (focused on climate change) they said it implied too much money, while they seemed more interested in local adaptation strategies; hence we withdrew.

**Simon** (on the continuation on NP, with CG)

It is a new idea to me to developing parallel track to SLM. Moving this steering group to an independent think tank would be very interesting; if it would, it is the great way to develop,

**Dejene**

The government declined the independent climate change task force; independent couldn’t get attention from the government side, so suggest to put it under CGIAR

**Betru**

In my view, in order to attract donors and to get the MOA to support we have to define the way this platform is playing a key role. Try to come up with attractive kind of proposal which enable us get fund also attention from government

**Kifle**

There is a need for us to develop a scenario, we have 8 month, it is short time, we are only interested the platform to continue, how do we see this materializing to continue?

**Simon**

One of the views in the CG system is that we are happy to facilitate, but Ethiopian institutes have to own the platform. The CG system is also under changing dynamics, but we will get clear directions by September how to design new programs and access resources for different research and development programs; but we can carry it, it will change as the CG system is changing, our alignment also changes.

**Deres**

Let me share the forum for learning (FLOWS ) experiences, which is there since 2006; the forum is currently owned by MWE; in ripple what we did is that we approached the rain foundation , secure project funding; sign Memorandum of understanding with MWE. Since then MWE owned this forum and leads. Ripple made facilities available and allocate resources. **Deres is asked to share the document with the group**

**Betru**

The platforms should be embedded in the CGIAR but shouldn’t leave it as independent; it could be within the CG but with other partners…..

**Kees**

We need a follow up discussion and share

**Adane**

We should meet, we need to have another meeting to discuss further; we need to have another meeting before summer

**Agreed that an extra SC meeting will be organized to discuss alternatives/models for continuation of the platform; this may need to be preceded by an internal reflection of ILRI/IWMI (what do they want?).**

1. **Next national platform meeting and TWG learning events**

Postponed to next meeting

1. **Summarizing action items and next meeting**
2. Simon to check whether it is possible to compensate SC members of attending meetings.
3. Belay to follow up on SLM meeting with Melaku.
4. SC members requested to respond to draft TOR by 6 May.
5. SC members requested to respond to NBDC key messages by 6 May.
6. Deres to share document on organizational arrangements of FLOWS.
7. Extra SC meeting will be organized to discuss alternative models for continuation.

**Next meeting preferably before the summer, but will be called by the secretariat.**